

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

New claims 16-24 are added. Support for the new claims is found, for example, in FIG. 2 and the corresponding disclosure on page 9, line 18, through page 10, line 11, of the specification.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6 and 16-24 are currently pending.

II. PRIORITY CLAIM

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 UNDER 35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claim 1 is amended to overcome the rejection.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3 AND 5 UNDER 35 USC 102(E) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HOUVENER (US PATENT NO. 6,397,194)

The present invention as recited, for example, in independent claim 1, relates to a data accumulation system comprising (a) a data output device for outputting data required by a user; (b) a data storage device including a storing portion for storing a part of data imparted from the data output device; and (c) a data checking terminal that is a portable terminal capable of wireless communication with the data storage device. As recited, for example, in claim 1, the data checking terminal has a display for displaying data imparted from the data output device to the data storage device so that a user can check whether or not the data are worth storing.

Please note that claim 1 is amended to clarify that the data checking terminal is a portable terminal capable of wireless communication with the data storage device.

The present invention as recited, for example, in claim 1, can be understood, for example, from FIG. 2 and the corresponding disclosure on page 9, line 18, through page 10, line 11, of the specification.

Houvenner does not disclose that a data checking terminal is a portable terminal capable of wireless communication with a data storage device as recited, for example, in the amended claim 1.

Moreover, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner wrote: "Since the limitation of the

data checking terminal is wireless and portable is exemplary, it does not limit the scope of the claim, such that Houvener does not apply." Based on this comment by the Examiner, it is believed that the amendments to claim 1 clearly distinguish over Houvener.

Further, Houvener relates to the display an image of a person so that identify of a purchaser can be verified at the point of sale. See, for example, column 9, lines 31-36; and column 11, lines 31-36, of Houvener. See also steps 165 and 175 in FIG. 6B of Houvener.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Houvener does not disclose or suggest that data imparted from the data output device to the data storage device is displayed on a portable terminal *so that a user can check whether or not the data are worth storing*, as recited, for example, in claim 1. For example, Houvener does not have any disclosure indicating that a user decides whether displayed information should be stored or not. Instead, the displayed information in Houvener is simply used for identification purposes at the point of sale.

New independent claim 16 specifically recites that the portable terminal (a) wirelessly communicates with the data storage device to cause the portable terminal to display, to a user of the portable terminal, the data output from the data output device and received by the data storage device, (b) wirelessly communicates with the data storage device to allow the user to input a command to the portable terminal indicating whether the data output by the data output device and received by the data storage device should be stored in the data storage device, in accordance with a decision by the user after viewing the data displayed by the portable terminal, and (c) wirelessly communicates with the data storage device to transmit the inputted command from the portable terminal to the data storage device to cause the data storage device to store the data output by the data output device and received by the data storage device in accordance with the transmitted command. New independent claims 23 and 24 recite similar features. It is respectfully submitted that Houvener does not disclose or suggest such features. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 16-24 are clearly allowable over Houvener.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**V. REJECTION OF CLAIM 2 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER HOUVENER IN VIEW OF PALME**

The above comments for distinguishing over Houvener also apply here.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VI. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER HOUVENER IN VIEW OF MANUEL FRONT PAGE 98

The above comments for distinguishing over Houvener also apply here.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VII. REJECTION OF CLAIM 6 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER HOUVENER IN VIEW OF ANSWERS.COM

The above comments for distinguishing over Houvener also apply here.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with filing of this response, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

July 19, 2005

By:

Paul I. Kravetz
Registration No. 35,230

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501